

Pratas, Fernanda, Sandra Pereira & Clara Pinto. 2016. Foreword: challenging the frontiers between "nations". In Fernanda Pratas, Sandra Pereira & Clara Pinto (eds) *Coordination/Subordination: Form and Meaning. Selected papers from CSI Lisbon, 2014*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing, xii-xx.

FOREWORD: CHALLENGING THE FRONTIERS BETWEEN “NATIONS”

FERNANDA PRATAS, SANDRA PEREIRA
AND CLARA PINTO

1. Introduction

Complex sentences have been at the core of cross-linguistic studies over the past decades. As a way to account for the linkage between clauses within these intricate structures, the traditional coordination/subordination divide has certainly proved crucial, offering a basis for the development of numerous ground-breaking formal tools, both in syntactic and in semantic domains.

More recent studies, however, have defied this traditional boundary, either because they have gone further into the theoretical implications of prior analyses or because they are focused on novel data: from still scarcely studied languages, from dialectal and diachronic variation or from language acquisition (cf. Haspelmath 2007, Ledgeway 2007, van Verstraete 2007, among many others).

Before describing some of these challenges, we must say that there are indeed two types of clauses that seem to exhibit a syntactic behaviour as, respectively, coordinate clauses and subordinate clauses. The first type concerns clauses headed by connectives like ‘and’/‘or’, the second type consists of typical complement clauses. The fundamental syntactic properties of coordination, as opposed to subordination, were identified by Quirk *et al.* (1985) and have acquired a status of syntactic tests to distinguish one type from the other. With Quirk *et al.* (1985) as a point of departure, Lobo (2003) applied some of these syntactic tests to numerous clauses, mainly in Portuguese, and her results show that the behaviour of what we call here the first type is the exact opposite of the second (Lobo 2003:39). More specifically, clauses headed by *e* ‘and’ or by *ou* ‘or’ reject: (i) embedding, (ii) being preposed, (iii) extraction, and (iv) coordination; in European Portuguese (v) they do not trigger proclisis. Moreover, the connectives ‘and’/‘or’ may link (vi) non-clausal units, like noun, verb, adverb or adjective phrases, and (vii) more than two elements. Some complement clauses seem to display reverse results in all these tests. Therefore, under a strictly syntactic perspective, we could have here a clear division between these two groups, the first representing coordination, the second illustrating subordination.

Just after this preliminary point of the description, however, one first problem immediately pops up: what about all the other clause types that have generally been subsumed under the subordination label? Adverbial clauses, for instance, which, besides being a particularly heterogeneous set of constructions themselves, may create different kinds of interlacing relations with other structure types. In fact, bigger challenges arise when we attempt to go further in either one of four directions:

- A. take the syntactically coordinate clauses mentioned above and try to confirm their real meaning in *various specific contexts* (some of them may in fact have a subordinate-like interpretation)
- B. take some apparently subordinate clauses and consider their *occasional use* as independent propositions;
- C. question why there should be any severe divide between some types of clauses, just (presumably) because they have different syntactic configurations, even if their meaning is *always* so similar;
- D. analyse in detail the strict syntactic status of other types of structures traditionally placed on the coordination or the subordination shelves; they may show more or less contradictory results in the above mentioned tests and, moreover, may have undergone significant diachronic changes.

The workshop CSI Lisbon 2014 has been a privileged stage for discussing these challenges to the traditional confines of coordination and subordination, along with various formulations of the properties of various complex clauses. Both typological studies and formal grammatical analyses within a generative framework were encouraged, and the outcome was an intense debate anchored on the innovative insights that novel linguistic data allow for.

The papers in this volume, all of them resulting from works presented at the workshop, appear by alphabetical order of the authors' surnames, and are briefly introduced in the next sections. Section 2 presents one paper focused on two particular coordination connectives, and one paper that discusses a specific case of adverbial subordination. Section 3 describes the papers that elaborate on different expressions of syntax/semantics mismatches. Finally, section 4 presents the papers devoted to the analysis of phenomena that, one way or the other, challenge the syntactic barriers between different types of clauses.

2. Theoretical (re)definitions in syntax

In this section, we present two papers that do not actually confront the syntactic boundaries between the types of constructions under analysis in this volume. One of them describes some properties of two coordination connectives, and the other discusses the syntax of adverbial subordination.

When considering a 'with' vs. 'and' divide among languages regarding coordination, Creoles have often been classified as 'with'-languages. However, when discussing the behaviour and restrictions of two coordinating conjunctions in Mauritian, a French-based Creole, **Hassamal** (p. 135) argues that both *e* and *ek* (the latter originates from the French preposition *avec* 'with') are 'and' conjunctions. Interestingly, this conjunction *ek* coexists with the true preposition *ek* 'with'. In (1) we find an example of *ek* as a preposition; in (2) *ek* is a conjunction.

- (1) *Paul ena enn lakaz ek/avek zardin.*
 Paul have one house with garden
 'Paul has a house with garden.'
- (2) *Mo pe al laplaz ar Paul ek ar Marie.*
 1SG PROG go beach with Paul and with Marie
 'I am going to the beach with Paul and with Marie.'

Although the conjunctions *e* and *ek* show the same syntactic behaviour, which the author formalizes within the HSPG framework (Head-driven Phrase structure grammar; Pollard & Sag 1987 and subsequent works), there are some differences at the interpretation level: in cases of clausal coordination, the conjunction *ek* conveys the reading of a single event, with the two simultaneous sub-events being an extended effect of its specialization in the coordination of noun phrases.

The core debate on adverbial subordination is frequently concerned with the exact structural point where integration takes place. **Von Wietersheim & Featherston** (p. 269) discuss this specific aspect of clause linkage in German, adopting Haegeman's (2003, 2004; Frey 2011) division into central adverbial clauses (CACs), like the one in (3), and peripheral adverbial clauses (PACs), like the one in (4).

- (3) *Anna hört Musik, während sie morgens durch den Park joggt.*
 Anna listens.to music while she mornings through the park runs
 'Anna listens to music while she runs through the park in the morning.'
- (4) *Anna faulenz abends, während sie morgens durch den Park joggt.*
 Anna relaxes evenings while/whereas she mornings through the park runs
 'Anna relaxes at home in the evening while she runs through the park in the morning.'

They investigate whether binding, in particular the violation of Principle C, can work as evidence for structural integration of 'while'-clauses, thus helping determine their more central or peripheral status (cf. Lohnstein 2004). They use various experiments to gather more precise clues about the complex relations between these adverbial clauses and the matrix clauses, and, along the way, also find evidence to question the proper role of Principle C and the true nature of binding idiosyncrasies.

3. Syntax / semantics mismatches

This section subsumes the challenges described as A., B. and C. in section 1. They all concern a certain lack of correspondence between the syntactic status of some structures and their possible meanings. The three papers presented in subsection 3.1 analyse syntactically coordinate structures that may have a subordinate meaning. The paper presented in subsection 3.2 investigates constructions that show a different mismatch: they have a true independent interpretation whereas, syntactically, they seem subordinate clauses. Subsection 3.3 presents two papers related to one of those problematic pairs of semantically similar sentences whose syntactic status has been subject to cross-linguistic debate.

3.1. Coordinate clauses with a subordinate meaning

The challenge described in A. (section 1) concerns some well-known syntax/semantics mismatches, and to exemplify this we also use here one much cited case involving the coordinator ‘and’ (Culicover & Jackendoff 1997:196):

- (5) One more can of beer and I’m leaving.
Meaning: ‘If you have one more can of beer, I’m leaving.’

Another good example of this, but involving a coordinator of the type ‘or’, is the Portuguese sentence in (6), which also has the interpretation of a conditional structure:

- (6) *Sentas-te* *já* *ou* *ponho-te* *de* *castigo*.¹
sit:PR.2SG-2SG now or put:PR.1SG-2SG of ground
Literal: ‘You sit now or I ground you.’
Meaning: ‘If you don’t sit right now, I will ground you.’

Thus, at the semantic level we have a subordinate relation, syntactically expressed as a type of coordination.

Another case of European Portuguese constructions that semantically are subordinate but, according to Brito & Matos (p. 45), behave syntactically as an instance of coordination is illustrated in (7).

- (7) *Os* *miúdos* *portaram-se mal.* *De* *tal* *modo* *que* *os* *pais*
the kids behaved badly. In such.a way that the parents
foram *chamados* *à* *escola.*
were called to.the school.
‘The kids behaved badly. In such a way that their parents have
been instated to go to the school.’

In constructions where consecutive clauses, be they finite or non-finite, have an antecedent, we get a clear relation of subordination at all levels. For the so-called free consecutives (cf. Giusti 1991), like the one in (7), the authors argue that the syntactic relation established is in fact of coordination, which in some cases is of juxtaposition – these structures involve an intricate connection between the first clause and a quantifying expression in the consecutive clause. There is, therefore, a case of disparity between syntax and semantics, since, despite their coordinate behaviour, the free consecutive is interpreted as a modifier of the whole previous sentence.

Several syntactic and semantic (dis)similarities between specific coordinate clauses and some peripheral adverbial clauses have also been subject to cross-linguistic debate. This is the object of study in Canceiro (p. 69). In order to account for the level of embedding of these constructions in European Portuguese, she uses a Reference Judgment Comprehension Task (McDaniel and Cairns, 1990 a,b) to investigate the referential relations established by omitted subjects. The author tests different types of coordinate constructions, such as copulative coordination (example in (8)), and contrasts them with, for instance, non-peripheral adverbial clauses like the one in (9).

- (8) [-] *deu* *aulas* *e* *ele estudou* *Biologia.*
[-] taught.3SG classes and he studied.3SG Biology
‘[...] taught classes and he studied Biology.’

- (9) *Ela podia* *comer* *um bolo* *porque ela foi* *à padaria.*
she could eat one cake because she went to.the bakery
‘She could eat a cake because she went to the bakery.’

¹ In Lobo (2003: 60 fn40), there is a variation of this example for Portuguese with a structure of the type ‘either’... ‘or’:

- (i) *Ou* *te* *sentas* *ou* *ponho-te* *de* *castigo.*
or 2SG sit:PR.2SG or put:PR.1SG-2SG of ground
Literal: ‘Either you sit, or I ground you.’
Meaning: ‘If you don’t sit, I will ground you.’

We find, however, that this example does not meet our objectives at this specific point: this structure, despite having been traditionally classified as an instance of coordination, does not fit in with the syntactically well-behaved coordinate clauses whose meaning we intend to question. In fact, correlatives are problematic for a coordination analysis even at the syntactic level. Therefore, this example would, at most, be a good choice to illustrate the challenge that we enunciate in C.

Although the general results seem to indicate that binding, which involves c-commanding relations and, thus, unambiguous syntactic hierarchies, can be a useful test to understand how fully integrated a clause is, in some cases the informants' interpretation suggests another path.

Similarly, Mandinka exhibits various cases of ambiguity between subordination and coordination, and several examples are discussed by **Creissels** (p. 119), who presents a wide range of data from this still scarcely studied West African language. Some independent assertive utterances in juxtaposition, for example, can sometimes be interpreted as having a purpose reading. This is the case of the sentence in (10), which can have two different interpretations: the first one corresponding to a purpose clause and the second one to juxtaposition.

- (10) *I wúli-tá ka táa.*
 3PL rise-CPL INF leave
 1. 'They rose in order to leave.'
 2. 'They rose and left.'

Even more intriguing is the case of some adverbial-like constructions that have a coordinate-like interpretation; in fact, they do not act as modifiers. This coexists with apparently identical purpose adverbial constructions, which involve an infinitive or subjunctive clause and are properly classified as instances of subordination.

3.2. Not as subordinate as they seem

The challenge mentioned in B. (section 1) concerns, among others, the phenomenon known as insubordination (Evans 2007). This occurs with sequences like the one in (11):

- (11) If you could just sit here for a while, please. (Evans 2007)

This sentence exhibits the morpho-syntactic features of an adverbial clause (more specifically, a conditional). In this particular use, however, its subordinate status can be questioned, either under the syntactic or the semantic point of view. As Evans (2007) points out, it actually functions as a request.

Studying these structures in English under a diachronic perspective, **Schröder** (p. 245) defends that we should not try to define dependency on syntactic grounds, but rather by using semantic and pragmatic criteria. She examines four corpora of Early Modern English and provides the answer to two questions, one on the statistic evolution of the use of these constructions, the other on the relations between insubordination and different types of structures.

3.3. Different and yet so similar

The challenge stated in C. (section 1) explicitly concerns pairs of clause types like (i) adversative/concessive clauses, and (ii) explicative/causal clauses. The first elements in these pairs have traditionally been analysed as instances of coordination, the second elements have been classified as a case of subordinate relations. The syntactic tests in Quirk *et al.* (1985), however, do not present clear results. Take, for instance, English causal clauses headed by 'for'. In spite of being recognised as a case of subordination, they cannot be preposed (cf. Quirk *et al.*: 922), a restriction that is associated with coordination.

Different contradictions are also attested in other languages. Consider the following examples in French (Lobo 2003:44-45, following Piot 1988):

- (12) a. Jean n'est pas venu, *car* il est malade.
 b. **Car* il est malade, Jean n'est pas venu.
 (13) a. Jean n'est pas venu *parce qu'*il est malade.
 b. *Parce qu'*il est malade, Jean n'est pas venu.

Regarding restrictions on movement, *car* looks like a coordinator, whereas *parce que* behaves like a subordinator (clauses headed by *car* cannot be preposed, a restriction that is not imposed on clauses headed by *parce que*). On the other hand, *car* presents some properties that are typical of subordinators, clearly distinguishing it from French coordinators of the type 'and' or 'or'.

Moreover, many of the sentences used to illustrate the elements in each of the pairs mentioned above – adversative/concessive clauses and explicative/causal clauses – are truly semantically related (cf. (12a) and (13a)). For many speakers across languages, numerous instances of these are indeed difficult to distinguish.

In European Portuguese, some causal constructions challenge the definition of coordination as a form of clause linkage that does not create any structural dependencies. In these cases, as **Aguiar & Barbosa** (p. 1) point out, the coordinate conjunction *e* ‘and’ “establishes an asymmetric semantic relation between the terms conjoined” (cf. Blühdorn 2008), as can be seen in (14).

- (14) *O João não viu o chão molhado e escorregou.*
 the John not saw the floor wet and slipped
 ‘John didn’t notice the wet floor and slipped.’

The authors study these constructions under a sociolinguistics approach, following the variationist model (Labov 1966, 1994, 2000). They anchor their analysis on the premise that “syntactic structures that unequivocally indicate the type of relation established are easier to process (Noordman & Blijzer 2000), as opposed to syntactic connections whose semantic relation established is inferred”, and try to identify the possible connections between some social variables, especially the level of education, and the use of specific linguistic variables, such as the type of syntactic structure and the connective.

Also focused on the various uses of causal structures is the study by **Catasso** (p. 93). In standard German, clauses headed by *weil* ‘because’, like the one in (15), can be taken as an instance of coordination (cf. Antomo & Steinbach 2010).

- (15) *Das macht Berlin hauptsächlich, weil die haben auch eine große Zahl von Italienern.*
 that does Berlin mainly because they have too a
 big number of Italians
 ‘Berlin does that primarily, because they have a large number of Italians, too.’

It has also been suggested (Pasch 1997) that their emergence is due to the lack of *denn*-clauses in spoken language. The fact that these structures exhibit a Verb Second (V2) word order, which in German is typical of independent structures (in contrast with the Verb final configurations of subordinate clauses), favours these paratactic proposals. Catasso, however, discusses all the arguments involved in these and other previous studies, and puts forward a subordinate analysis for these *weil*-clauses, taking a comparative perspective and grounding his views on syntactic evidence. Among the contributions of his paper to the cross-linguistic comprehension of explicative/causal clauses is the idea that the pragmatic implications of these structures may be more relevant than their syntactic classification as coordinate or subordinate.

4. Contradictions at the strict syntactic level

Finally, this section is devoted to the challenge pointed out in D. (section 1), which concerns the syntactic behaviour of several clause types. In other words, even under a strict syntactic analysis, various forms of complex sentences do not fit in well with any of the traditional labels (subsection 4.1). Some others have changed from one shelf to the other (4.2).

4.1. Synchronic complications

The serious problems to the syntactic diagnostics for some clause types may be exemplified by the comparative constructions in languages like Portuguese. Consider the sentence in (16), of the type analysed in Pereira, Pinto and Pratas (2014):

- (16) *O Pedro comprou mais livros do que o João me deu.*
 the Pedro bought more books do que the João 1SG gave
 ‘Pedro bought more books than João gave to me.’

Are comparatives like this a case of subordination? If so, do they involve adverbial clauses? Or, considering some word order restrictions (namely, obligatory proclisis), are relative clauses better candidates? Furthermore, how can we accommodate the fact that they also show typical features of coordination, such as their behaviour regarding ellipsis or the properties of their connectives?

According to **Paul** (p. 185), several constructions in Mandarin Chinese, such as adverbial clauses like (17), also raise serious problems to the traditional syntactic classifications.

- (17) *Rúguǒ tā bù lái, wǒ jiù zìjǐ qù.*
 if 3SG NEG come 1SG then self go
 ‘If he doesn’t come, I’ll go on my own.’

Illustrating her investigation with many relevant examples of the language under study, she acknowledges the fact that some properties in focus here apply to other languages as well. The author discusses the categories conjunction and adverbial subordinator, and also the exact point at which an adverbial clause is merged in the structure (in Mandarin Chinese, some are merged at a topic projection, which is higher than the main clause).

Some other constructions that, in different languages, have raised several syntactic problems are correlative comparatives (CCs). **Bîlbîie** (p. 23) illustrates this with, among others, the examples in (18) for English and in (19) for Romanian.

(18) The more I read, the more I understand.

(19) *Cu câț citeșc (mai mult), cu atât înțeleg (mai bine).*
 with how-much I-read (more), with that-much I-understand (better)
 ‘The more I read, the more I understand.’

In her analysis, the author assumes that: semantically, CCs always involve a relation of conditionality and/or proportionality; syntactically, they can assume different patterns and, therefore, “a universal macrosyntactic structure that holds cross-linguistically cannot be proposed” (*contra* Den Dikken, 2005). She discusses data from English and also from several Romance languages, including Romanian, and relies on the HSPG framework to elaborate on her proposal.

4.2. Diachronic transitions

The effects of diachronic change on the syntax of some constructions can also be very interesting, since it is not clear why and how a type of structure can make the transition between coordination and subordination, in either direction. One example of this is the contemporary Portuguese *senão* (cf. Colaço 2005), which, despite being considered a marker of coordination, exhibits an intriguing behaviour. Martins, Pereira and Pinto (forthcoming) show that contemporary *senão* originates from the reanalysis of *se* ‘if’ + *não* ‘no’ in Old Portuguese negative conditionals. This evolution may account for the different behaviour of the structures headed by *senão* when compared to other instances of exceptive coordination.

Pseudo-coordination is another phenomenon that results from a diachronic change within the structure of complex sentences. **Ross** (p. 209) investigates contemporary verbal pseudo-coordinate constructions, which, cross-linguistically, use a connective of the type ‘and’ but do not obey the criteria that define typical coordination. For instance, they tolerate unbalanced extraction, as in (20).

(20) Here’s the whiskey which I went (to the store) and bought.

The author illustrates this phenomenon with a wide range of data from different languages of the world: from Europe, Africa, the Middle East, Asia, Oceania and the Americas. According to him, from a sample of 325 languages (see WALS: Haspelmath *et al.* 2005), 46 are considered to display an instance of pseudo-coordination.

Ledgeway (p. 157) assumes the existence of “genuine coordination” and applies all its relevant syntactic tests to show that, synchronically, the structures from the Apulian dialects, Italy, illustrated in (21) are a case of pseudo-coordination, “namely subordination”.

(21) *Va a chiama.*
 he.goes and he.calls
 ‘He goes to call.’

In his detailed study of aspectual constructions with ‘go’/‘stand’, the author discusses a particular diachronic case of grammaticalization that is also visible today, since some dialects illustrate a transitional phase. The evolution in question is from biclausal coordination, where the two conjuncts were linked by a coordinator, to monoclausal subordination, the second conjunct being now a complement clause. This change is deeply related to the behaviour of those aspectual predicates, which have undergone inflectional attrition to become aspectual markers.

The results of this investigation will certainly provide insightful information on, among other topics, the properties of the clause functional structure. Importantly, they have already demonstrated that, as Ledgeway puts it, “the formal boundaries between coordination and subordination are considerably more fluid than is often assumed.”

Acknowledgements

We are particularly grateful to the authors that have accompanied us in this adventure. This volume is the result of a long, truly collaborative work, with all the expected rewards and great moments of discovery.

We are also thankful to our colleagues in the organizing committee of CSI Lisbon 2014, Adriana Cardoso, Rita Marquilhas and Ana Maria Martins, and to all the researchers that participated in the conference.

Finally, we thank the funders of the following projects: P.S. - *Post Scriptum* (ERC Advanced Grant - GA 295562) and WOChWEL - *Word Order and Word Order Change in Western European Languages* (PTDC/CLE-LIN/121707/2010).

References

- ANTOMO, Mailin and Markus STEINBACH. 2010. Desintegration und Interpretation. *Weil-V2-Sätze an der Schnittstelle zwischen Syntax, Semantik und Pragmatik. Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft* 29: 1-37.
- BLÜHDORN, Hardarik. 2008. Subordination and coordination in syntax, semantics and discourse. Evidence from the study of connectives. In Cathrine FABRICIUS-HANSEN and Wiebke RAMM (eds.) *'Subordination' versus 'Coordination' in Sentence and Text. A cross-linguistic perspective*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 59-85.
- COLAÇO, Madalena. 2005. *Configurações de Coordenação Aditiva: Tipologia, Concordância e Extracção*. PhD Dissertation. University of Lisbon.
- CULICOVER, Peter W. and Ray JACKENDOFF. 1997. Semantic subordination despite syntactic coordination. *Linguistic Inquiry* 28(2): 195-217.
- DEN DIKKEN, Marcel. 2005. Comparative correlatives comparatively. *Linguistic Inquiry* 36: 497-532.
- EVANS, Nicolas. 2007. Insubordination and its uses. In Irina NIKOLAEVA (ed.) *Finiteness: Theoretical and Empirical Foundations*. New York: Oxford University Press, 366-431.
- FREY, Werner. 2011. Peripheral adverbial clauses, their licensing and the prefield in German. In E. BREINDL, G. FERRARESI and A. VOLODINA (eds.) *Satzverknüpfung – Zur Interaktion von Form, Bedeutung und Diskursfunktion*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 41-77.
- GIUSTI, Giuliana. 1991. Le frase consecutive. In L. RENZI and G. SALVI (orgs.) *Grande Grammatica Italiana di Consultazione*, volume II. Bologna: Il Mulino, 820-827.
- HAEGEMAN, Liliane. 2003. Conditional Clauses: External and Internal Syntax. *Mind & Language* 18(4): 317-339.
- HAEGEMAN, Lilliane. 2004. The syntax of adverbial clauses and its consequences for topicalisation. In M. COENE, G. DE CUYPER and Y. D'HULST (eds.) *Antwerp Papers in Linguistics - Current Studies in Comparative Romance Linguistics* 107 Antwerp: University of Antwerp, 61-90.
- HASPELMATH, Martin, Matthew S. DRYER, David GIL and Bernard COMRIE (eds.) 2005. *World atlas of language structures*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <http://wals.info/>.
- HASPELMATH, Martin. 2007. Coordination. In Tim SHOPEN (ed.) *Language Typology and Syntactic Description. Volume II: Complex Constructions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1-51.
- LABOV, William. 1966. *The social stratification of English in New York City*. Washington: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- LABOV, William. 1994. *Principles of linguistic change: internal factors*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- LABOV, William. 2000. *Principles of linguistic change: external factors*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- LEDGEWAY, Adam. 2007. Diachrony and Finiteness: Subordination in the Dialects of Southern Italy. In Irina NIKOLAEVA (ed.) *Finiteness: Theoretical and Empirical Foundations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 335-65.
- LOBO, Maria. 2003. *Aspectos da Sintaxe das Orações Subordinadas Adverbiais do Português*. PhD Dissertation. Universidade Nova de Lisboa.
- LOHNSTEIN, Horst. 2004. Variable und invariante Strukturmerkmale von Satzkonnectoren. In H. BLÜHDORN, E. BREINDL and U. WASSNER (eds.) *Brücken schlagen – Grundlagen der Konnektorensyntax*. Berlin, New York: de Gruyter, 137-160.
- MARTINS, Ana Maria, Sandra PEREIRA and Clara PINTO. forthcoming. The diachronic path of *senão*: from conditional subordination to exceptive coordination. In B. EGEDI and V. HEGEDŰS (eds.) *Selected Papers from DIGS 2014*. Oxford University Press.
- MCDANIEL, Dana and Helen Smith CAIRNS. 1990a. The child as informant: Eliciting linguistic judgments from young children. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research* 19(5): 331 - 344.

- MCDANIEL, Dana and Helen Smith CAIRNS. 1990b. The processing and acquisition of control structures by young children. In L. FRAZIER and J. de VILLIERS (eds.) *Language Processing and Language Acquisition*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- NOORDMAN, Leo G. M. and Femke BLIJZER. 2000. On the processing of causal relations. In E. COUPER-KUHLEN and B. KORTMANN (eds.) *Cause, Condition, Concession and Contrast. Cognitive and Discourse Perspectives*. Berlin/ New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 35-56.
- PASCH, Renate. 1997. *Weil* mit Hauptsatz - Kuckucksei im *denn*-Nest. *Deutsche Sprache* 25(3): 252-271.
- PEREIRA, Sandra, Clara PINTO and Fernanda PRATAS. 2014. Construções comparativas em português: porque algumas são mais iguais que outras. *Textos Seleccionados do XXIX Encontro da Associação Portuguesa de Linguística*. Lisboa: APL, 437-444.
- POLLARD, Carl and Ivan SAG. 1994. *Head-driven Phrase structure Grammar*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- QUIRK, Randolph, Sidney GREENBAUM, Geoffrey LEECH and Jan SVARTNIK. 1985. *A comprehensive grammar of the English language*. 3rd edition. London and New York: Longman.
- vanVERSTRAETE, Jean-Christoph. 2007. The many faces of subordination, in Germanic and beyond. In Matti MIESTAMO and Bernhard WÄLCHLI (eds.) *New Challenges in Typology. Broadening the Horizons and Redefining the Foundations*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 363-383.